

7 October 2005

Response to SJR 35 Working Group questions.

These responses focus primarily on the Board of Landscape Architects unless otherwise noted:

- A. Overall, I'm sure there are improvements that can be made to all regulatory boards. Regarding our Board, the fact that it is governing a practice act needs to be clarified and understood by all parties. There is a belief by the State staff that ours is a title act. This has been substantially refuted by our national professional organization, the American Society of Landscape Architects.
- B. I think our Board, of two public and three professional members, provides just the right mix of viewpoints for thoughtful deliberations whenever that is required.
- C. Based upon our recent experience with the DLI staff, I think this is the area that needs the most review and evaluation.

Given that our profession has required practically no enforcement action by our Board, it is unclear why as many six state personnel (April 2005 Board Meeting) are required to attend a board meeting. Why, for example, must a staff attorney be present for all meetings? It would seem more fiscally responsible to have one on-call nearby, should the need arise. Having both presided over and attended many meetings in my career, I see no reason why one staff person, taking notes as needed with a tape recorder running, would not be sufficient for nearly all meetings.

The other particularly troubling issue is the manner by which the staff provides budget information. There needs to be far more transparency with regard to how the budgets are prepared and specifically what some of the various items are. As I stated in my August 30<sup>th</sup> letter to Keith Kelly, "...these documents (provided by staff) are only minimally helpful, since they use codes, abbreviations and methodology that are neither understood by nor adequately explained to the licensees, Board members or public. Even when asked, we have received only partial explanations, which have only left us further confused." For whatever reason, Mr. Kelly's response failed to address these concerns.

At this time, I am not sure that I will be in attendance at the October 12<sup>th</sup> meeting. If I fail to attend, I'm not sure which of the five policy issue groups I would choose. I'm inclined to choose b) regarding statutes, but I will follow with another message prior to the meeting, if necessary.

Respectfully submitted:

**Kent E. Watson, FASLA**  
**Kent Watson & Associates**  
**Landscape Architecture**  
**210 N. Higgins Ave., St. 334**  
**Missoula, MT 59802 - (406) 721-3500 O; 880-3540 Cell;**  
**541-3541 Fax; E Mail: [Kentwla@aol.com](mailto:Kentwla@aol.com)**